1 1 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS 2 HOUSTON DIVISION 3 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA . H-04-025SS 4 . HOUSTON, TEXAS vs. . JUNE 21, 2013 5 . 1:32 P.M. JEFFREY K. SKILLING 6 7 8 9 TRANSCRIPT OF RE-SENTENCING BEFORE THE HONORABLE SIM LAKE 10 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE 11 12 13 APPEARANCES: 14 FOR THE GOVERNMENT: Patrick Stokes 15 Robert Heberle 16 Pamela J. Hicks US Department of Justice 17 1400 New York Avenue, NW Washington, DC 20530 18 FOR THE DEFENDANT JEFFREY K. SKILLING: 19 Daniel M. Petrocelli 20 M. Randall Oppenheimer Matthew Kline 21 David J. Marroso O'Melveny and Myers, LLP 1999 Avenue of the Stars 22 Suite 700 23 Los Angeles, California 90067-6035 24 Proceedings recorded by mechanical stenography, transcript produced by computer-aided transcription. 25 Cheryll K. Barron, CSR, CM, FCRR 713.250.5585

```
2
 1
     APPEARANCES: (Continued)
 2
     FOR THE DEFENDANT JEFFREY K. SKILLING: (Continued)
 3
           Ronald Gene Woods
           Attorney at Law
 4
           5300 Memorial Drive
           Suite 1000
 5
           Houston, Texas 77007
 6
     OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER:
 7
           Cheryll K. Barron, CSR, CMR, FCRR
           U.S. Courthouse
 8
           515 Rusk, Rm. 8016
           Houston, Texas 77002
 9
10
     ALSO PRESENT:
11
           Chad Nunez
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
        Cheryll K. Barron, CSR, CM, FCRR
                                                         713.250.5585
```

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

01:33 25

01:33

01:33 15

01:32

01:32

PROCEEDINGS

THE COURT: Good afternoon. Please be seated.

Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen. We're here this afternoon for resentencing of Mr. Jeffrey K. Skilling.

This is Criminal Action H-04-25.

Before we proceed with Mr. Skilling's resentencing, I want to be sure that Mr. Skilling understands and agrees to all of the provisions of the sentencing agreement entered into by him, his attorneys, and the Department of Justice. The agreement is filed as part of Docket Entry Number 1316.

Mr. Skilling, would you please come forward with your attorney and would the Government's attorney please come forward and would all of you please identify yourselves?

THE DEFENDANT: I'm Jeff Skilling, your Honor.

MR. PETROCELLI: Good afternoon, your Honor. Daniel Petrocelli for Mr. Skilling, along with Matt Kline, David Marroso, Randy Oppenheimer, and Ron Woods.

MR. STOKES: Good afternoon, your Honor. Patrick
Stokes for the United States. Along with me from the
Department of Justice is Robert Heberle and Pamela Hicks and
Special Agent Chad Nunez from the FBI.

THE COURT: Thank you. This agreement is somewhat out of the ordinary, so I'm going to assume for the purposes of the Rules of Criminal Procedure that it is subject to the same

requirements of a plea agreement, which means I must ask you a 1 01:33 2 number of questions. 3 First of all, Mr. Skilling, have you read the 4 agreement? 5 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I have, your Honor. 01:33 THE COURT: All right. When did you first read it? 6 7 THE DEFENDANT: Boy, I can't say that my memory is as 8 good as it used to be. Probably a month ago. I forget, your 9 Honor. THE COURT: Have you discussed the sentencing 10 01:34 11 agreement with your attorney Mr. Petrocelli? 12 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I have. 13 THE COURT: How much time have you spent discussing 14 the agreement with your attorney? 01:34 15 THE DEFENDANT: Several hours. 16 THE COURT: Okay. 17 THE DEFENDANT: At least. THE COURT: All right. Are you fully satisfied with 18 19 the advice and counsel that Mr. Petrocelli has provided you? 01:34 20 THE DEFENDANT: Absolutely, your Honor, yes. 21 THE COURT: All right. In order to be sure that you 22 understand and agree to all of the provisions of the sentencing 23 agreement, I want to review some of the terms with you now 24 aqain. So do you have a copy of the agreement before you?

MR. PETROCELLI: We do, your Honor.

01:34 25

01:36 25

THE COURT: If you will turn first to Paragraph 8 of the agreement, Paragraph 8 says, "For the reasons set forth below as 'Relevant Considerations,' the Government and the defendant agree to recommend jointly that the District Court apply a one-level downward variance and resentence the defendant using an adjusted offense level of 35, pursuant to United States Sentencing Guidelines. Given that the defendant is located in Criminal History Category I for resentencing purposes, the jointly recommended adjusted offense level will result in a jointly recommended guideline range of 168 to 210 months of imprisonment."

What I want you to understand in particular about that provision is that, as a result of the ruling of the United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit in January of 2009, your advisory guideline range, without giving effect to this agreement, would be 188 months to 235 months in prison. Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I do, your Honor.

THE COURT: Therefore, the effect of Paragraph 8 of the sentencing agreement is to recommend that your advisory guideline range be lowered by 20 months. Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I do.

THE COURT: All right. We'll continue with Paragraph 9 of the sentencing agreement.

01:36 1 2

01:37 5

7

8

6

4

9

10

11

01:37

12

13

14

01:37 15

16

17 18

19

01:38 20

22

21

23 24

01:38 25

"Neither the Government nor the defendant will seek any variance or departure from the jointly recommended guideline range. The Government may allocute at sentencing, but the Government will not take a position regarding the particular sentence the District Court should impose within the jointly recommended guideline range.

"The defendant agrees to waive all potential challenges to his convictions and sentence, including a motion for new trial pursuant to Federal Rule of Criminal Procedure 33, appeals, and collateral attacks, except as set forth in Paragraph 11. For purposes of this provision, the defendant's sentence shall include any applicable orders of restitution or forfeiture."

MR. PETROCELLI: It says "and forfeiture."

THE COURT: "And forfeiture." Thank you.

"Neither the Government nor the defendant will appeal a sentence imposed within the jointly recommended guidelines range. However, the Government and the defendant each reserve the right to appeal a sentence imposed outside this range."

Paragraph 12, "Neither the Government nor the defendant will object to the incorporation in the defendant's criminal judgment at resentencing of the criminal monetary penalties established by the District Court in its Order of Forfeiture of October 23rd, 2006, and criminal judgment on

October 25, 2006. Neither the Government nor the defendant will otherwise object to the continuing validity of the Stipulated Forfeiture and Restitution Settlement Agreement approved on October 23rd, 2006."

Paragraph 13, "The Government agrees that it will not oppose the defendant's request at resentencing or otherwise that he receive credit for approximately six weeks of home confinement he served prior to reporting to the custody of the United States Bureau of Prisons."

And, finally, Paragraph 14, "The Government acknowledges that, pursuant to the applicable laws and regulations, it must defer to the United States Bureau of Prisons with regard to any future requests by the defendant to the Bureau of Prisons that:

- (a) the defendant be entitled to participate in the Residential Drug Abuse Program; and
- (b) the defendant not be classified as a 'broad publicity' inmate pursuant to 28 Code of Federal Regulations, Section 524.72."

Now, the matters discussed in Paragraphs 13 and 14 of the sentencing agreement will be decided by the Bureau of Prisons.

Did you need to consult with Mr. Petrocelli?

THE DEFENDANT: For just one second, your Honor.

Would that be okay?

01:38

01:38

01:39

01:39

01:39

THE COURT: 01:40 1 Sure. 2 (Mr. Petrocelli confers with the defendant) 3 MR. PETROCELLI: Okay, your Honor. 4 THE COURT: You ready to proceed? 5 THE DEFENDANT: Yes. Thank you. 01:40 6 THE COURT: The matters that are covered in Paragraphs 7 13 and 14 will be decided by the Bureau of Prisons. But what I 8 want you to understand in particular is that the sentencing 9 agreement, and Section 10 in particular, provides that if the 10 Court sentences you to a term of imprisonment of 210 months or 01:40 11 less you will forever waive and give up any right to challenge 12 your conviction or sentence by any means, for any reason. 13 you understand that? 14 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor, I do. 01:40 15 THE COURT: Now, other than what is stated in the 16 sentencing agreement, has the United States Government made any 17 promises to you in connection with your resentencing? 18 THE DEFENDANT: No, your Honor, they have not. 19 THE COURT: Has anyone threatened you or forced you to 20 enter into the sentencing agreement? 01:41 21 THE DEFENDANT: No, your Honor. 22 THE COURT: Well, you paused there. Is there some 23 need to talk to Mr. Petrocelli? 24 THE DEFENDANT: No. No, your Honor. 01:41 25 THE COURT: All right.

713.250.5585

THE DEFENDANT: Just a little slower than I used to 1 01:41 2 be. 3 THE COURT: I realize this is an anxious event for everyone. We have plenty of time. So if you need to stop and 4 5 talk to Mr. Petrocelli, please feel free to do so. 01:41 6 THE DEFENDANT: Thank you, your Honor. 7 THE COURT: Finally, other than what is stated in the 8 sentencing agreement, has anyone promised you what sentence you 9 will receive today? 10 THE DEFENDANT: No, they have not. 01:41 11 THE COURT: All right. I have carefully considered 12 the sentencing agreement and the reasons that underlie it, and 13 I accept the sentencing agreement. 14 Now, the next matter is the third addendum to the 01:41 15 presentence report. Mr. Skilling, have you read the third 16 addendum to the presentence report? 17 THE DEFENDANT: No, I have not, your Honor. 18 MR. PETROCELLI: Can we have a copy of that? 19 (Mr. Petrocelli and the defendant confer) 01:42 20 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor, I've reviewed that in 21 the past, as well. 22 THE COURT: All right. Have you discussed it with 23 your attorney? 24 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I have. 01:42 25 THE COURT: Your attorney has not filed any objections

Cheryll K. Barron, CSR, CM, FCRR

to the third addendum. Mr. Petrocelli, do you have any objections to it?

MR. PETROCELLI: We do not.

01:42

01:43

01:43

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

01:44 25

01:44

01:43 15

THE COURT: Mr. Skilling, do you have any objections to the third addendum?

THE DEFENDANT: No, I do not.

THE COURT: All right. The Court adopts the third addendum to the presentence report.

In accordance with the third addendum, I find that your total offense level is 36, your criminal history category is one, and your advisory guideline range is 188 to 235 months in prison.

However, pursuant to the one-level downward variance recommended in the sentencing agreement, the agreed upon guideline range is 168 to 210 months in prison.

The Court has read the victim statements that were submitted to the Government and to the Court and the more than 200 letters submitted on behalf of Mr. Skilling. The Court has also read defendant's motion for judicial recommendations regarding prison designation and participation in the residential drug and alcohol program, which is Docket Entry 1331; and Jeffrey Skilling's resentencing memorandum, which is Docket Entry 1329; and the United States' memorandum in aid of sentencing, which is Docket Entry 1334.

I would like to compliment both the Government

and the defense. The memorandum were thorough, fair, and persuasive.

MR. PETROCELLI: Thank you, your Honor.

THE COURT: Mr. Skilling, you may now make a statement and present any information in mitigation. Then I will allow any victims to speak and the Government's attorney may speak and your lawyer may speak.

I remind the attorneys again I've read carefully the written presentations.

You may now proceed, sir.

THE DEFENDANT: Your Honor, I drafted a statement to the Court, which I am sure you have read. And I think it probably reflects best statements or comments that I could make to the Court. And so I really don't have anything else to say, your Honor.

THE COURT: I did read it. And I read your wife's statement and all the other statements. I particularly found the statement of former inmate Richard Wilson as very informative.

THE DEFENDANT: Thank you, your Honor.

THE COURT: You've made a positive impact on his life and the lives of many other people while you've been confined, and I applaud you for that effort.

MR. PETROCELLI: Shall we be seated, your Honor?

THE COURT: No -- you may, yes, of course.

01:44 10

01:44

12

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

11

13 14

01:45 15

16

17 18

19

01:45 20

21

2223

24

01:45 25

The Court's order of May 8th, 2013, required that 1 01:45 2 all victims must notify the Court by June 7, 2013, if they wish 3 to be heard today. Only one victim, Ms. Diana Peters, has 4 notified the Court that she wishes to be heard today. 5 Ms. Peters are you present? 01:46 6 MS. PETERS: Yes. 7 Would you like to come forward to the THE COURT: 8 microphone, please, so we can hear you better? 9 (Complies). MS. PETERS: Please identify yourself, and then you may 10 THE COURT: 01:46 11 proceed. 12 MS. PETERS: 13 14

Thank you. My name is Diana Peters, and I worked at Enron. I wanted to say thank you for letting me speak today.

Your Honor, I'm here speaking for the employees of Enron that cannot be here to speak for themselves. These employees came to work every day and gave 110 percent of their lives to Enron. They took pride in going out into the community, representing Enron and giving to Habitat for Humanity, the Star of Hope, and supporting the new stadium with the Enron name on it. These employees gave their hard work, vibrant spirit, loyalty and trust to Jeff Skilling and the other VP's within the company to build up the company they were so proud to be a part of.

Jeff Skilling betrayed that trust to those

01:46 15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

01:47 25

01:46

employees and played a part in the financial collapse of an amazing company.

Bill Peterson worked for the company's Lotus

Notes group. He was admitted to MD Anderson for cancer

treatment. When Enron filed bankruptcy, the company contacted
him, while he was in the hospital, to let him know he was laid
off. His wife sold their cars, their homes and moved in with a
sister in order to pay the COBRA insurance that Bill needed for
his care. Bill died in a borrowed bed.

Charles Prestwood worked at a plant, that Enron obtained, for 40 years. He retired and went home to work on his farm. Because his retirement was in Enron, he had to sell a portion of his farm and his house was all he had left. His legacy did not go on.

Sue Glenn worked as a clerk at Enron, raised her kids. In just a few years, she would have her house paid off to enjoy her retirement. She had to sell that home. She had to move in with her daughter, and she had a heart attack from the stress and died.

Your Honor, this is just some of the employees that have suffered from the Jeff Skilling criminal action.

Your Honor, I pray that your decision to give Jeff Skilling the maximum for the sentence of his crimes. And I thank you for your time.

THE COURT: You're welcome. And thank you for being

01:47

01:47

01:47

01:48

01:48

01:48 1 here today.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

01:50 25

01:49

01:49

01:49

01:49

The Court's records do not indicate any other potential victim notified the Court of an intent to speak today but if anybody thinks they did provide proper notice and wishes to speak, they may come forward and identify yourself and explain what notice you gave.

MR. TYCHON: I'm Stephan Tychon. I filed two requests by certified mail from --

THE COURT: Didn't I forbid you from speaking back in 2006?

MR. TYCHON: Yes. But I -- you asked me if I notified the Court, and this time I did.

THE COURT: Okay. Are you a -- did you ever work for Enron?

MR. TYCHON: I explained in my letter that Enron did business with Bechtel and Bechtel -- Enron Bechtel --

THE COURT: Your father worked for Bechtel years ago.

Is that correct?

MR. TYCHON: My father was first president of the world's biggest public private partnership, which is Exxon, Shell, and Dutch Government.

THE COURT: Well, as I explained to you in 2006, you're not a victim. And under the Victims' Rights Act, you have no right to speak today.

MR. TYCHON: Well, I think I am a victim.

01:50 1

2

3

5

4

6

01:50

8

7

9

01:50 10

11

13

12

14

01:51 15

17

18 19

01:51 20

21

22

23

24

01:51 25

THE COURT: Well, as between the two of us, it's my decision; and I say you're not. So have a seat.

All right. The Government may now make any additional arguments it wishes to make.

 $$\operatorname{MR.}$ STOKES: Thank you, your Honor. Your Honor, we are at the end --

THE COURT: Can the audience hear the Government?

You may want to speak loudly enough so you can be heard.

MR. STOKES: Sorry, your Honor.

Your Honor, we are at the end of a very long road, the road that this Court has been on certainly far longer than I have. And as the Court very well explained, the sentencing agreement really helps bring this to an end and has resolved a number of the outstanding issues that helps us bring finality to this case.

And we appreciate the Court clarifying what the sentencing agreement said. And if I may just briefly dwell on it, there's been a fair amount of confusion, I believe, as to what that sentencing agreement said. And I think it's important for the victims, certainly, to understand what that agreement did and did not do. And, certainly, what it did not do and the department did not do is agree to enter into an agreement —

THE COURT: Can everybody hear him?

01:51 1

3

4

5

6

01:51

7 8

9

01:51 10

11 12

13

14

01:52 15

16

17 18

19

01:52 20

21 22

23

24

01:52 25

Why don't you -- you won't offend me if you are seated when you make your presentation. That way, you could use the microphone.

MR. STOKES: Absolutely, your Honor.

THE COURT: It's a large courtroom. Sometimes our voice doesn't carry very well.

MR. STOKES: Your Honor, with regards to the sentencing agreement, the -- we appreciate the Court clarifying what the agreement actually said. There's been a fair amount of confusion about this. And the Government thinks -- the Department thinks it's important for the victims to understand what the agreement actually did do and what it didn't do.

Some of that confusion has been that the Government and the defense entered into an agreement to reduce Mr. Skilling's sentence by 10 years, and that's certainly not something the Department has agreed to and wouldn't agree to and wouldn't bring an agreement of that nature to the Court.

As the Court perfectly explained, we are starting from a place after the Fifth Circuit, the Court of Appeals, reversed the sentence and reduced it by between eight and a half and 11 years. And our agreement provides a one-level variance, which is in counterpoint to the Fifth Circuit's four-level reduction. The sentence we recommended is within the guidelines range of 168 to 210 months, which overlaps with the range that would be established by the Fifth Circuit. This

01:54 25

01:54

01:53 15

01:52

01:53

01:53

agreement ends the litigation. It brings finality. And importantly, it allows for us to distribute forfeited funds to the victims of Mr. Skilling's crimes, upwards of \$40 million, to the victims of Mr. Skilling's crimes and to thereby pay restitution owed by him.

The Court is certainly well aware of the record here, and I don't want to dwell on the facts. But Congress has mandated that the Government and certainly the Courts consider a number of factors, the 3553(a) factors, in determining an appropriate sentence. And we believe that, taken as a whole, the -- these factors and the evidence supports sentencing within this range.

In our sentencing agreement, we reserved the right to allocute in order to facilitate the Court in determining an appropriate sentence in determining -- taking the measure of the whole man, of Mr. Skilling, and coming up with the appropriate sentence. And under the agreement, we think that -- we take no position as to what specific sentence within that range we would recommend. Simply, we are recommending a sentence within that range.

In reaching our determination and in coming to the conclusion that a sentence of 168 to 210 months was appropriate, we considered, first and foremost, the need to pay restitution. This litigation has gone on for years.

Mr. Skilling was convicted more than 10 years ago -- I'm sorry.

01:56 25

01:55

01:55 15

01:54

01:54

01:54

These crimes took place more than 10 years ago. He was convicted more than six years ago. And due to the lengthy litigation, a substantial amount of forfeited funds from him, more than \$41 million worth, have been tied up and we've been unable to distribute those.

And as a result of this agreement, we're now able to promptly cause the distribution of them. And this will complete the process of stripping Mr. Skilling of his ill-gotten gains and ensuring that those gains are distributed back to the victims of his crimes. In total, once these funds are — the final order of forfeiture is signed and these funds are released, the Government will have forfeited over a hundred million dollars from the perpetrators of the fraud schemes at Enron and distributed those to the victims of these crimes. In total, the Government will have distributed more than \$560 million, both from the SEC and the Department of Justice, to the victims.

Your Honor, we also believe that the Level 35 that we've recommended, 168 to 210 months, appropriately accounts for the conduct that's we have. The Court sat through a four-month trial and knows the facts far better than I. But what I would say, your Honor, is that what was true then is true now. The Enron crimes, Mr. Skilling's crimes, are some of the largest -- represent some of the largest and most significant corporate frauds ever tried, ever discovered, and

ever brought to a conviction in this country.

01:57 25

01:56

01:56

01:56

01:57

01:57

Mr. Skilling was not only at the pinnacle of Enron, but he was at the pinnacle of these fraud schemes. He lied to employees, he lied to shareholders, he lied to auditors, he lied to the investing public, and he lied to the SEC in order to advance his and Enron's cause. And that was — they did this by essentially accounting hocus pocus. They hid losses. They created phantom earnings. They sought to give the false appearance that Enron was either meeting or outperforming targets that they had set, in order to meet Wall Street's expectations.

But the reality was that Enron was faltering, that key business lines were losing hundreds of millions of dollars, that billions of dollars in assets were overvalued on Enron's books. Despite having this information at his — in his head, at his ready, Mr. Skilling, after retiring from the company in August of 2001, stepping down as CEO and leaving the company, shortly thereafter, in September of 2001, took advantage of his insider knowledge. He sold over 500,000 shares of his Enron stock and made more than \$15.5 million from it.

He subsequently was questioned by the SEC about this and lied, in testimony to the SEC, about his reasons for doing so. And the Court found as much, as well. Mr. Skilling was also convicted of insider trading in connection with that.

01:57

01:58

01:58

01:58

01:59

01:59

And, certainly, the other shareholders, the employees of Enron, those who didn't have this inside information weren't to lucky and would have liked to have had the information Mr. Skilling had and knew, about where Enron actually stood, what it's true financial condition was.

Now, your Honor, I certainly don't mean to paint that Enron was a fraudulent business. It is certainly true that Mr. Skilling, with the assistance of others, bilked one of the largest companies in the country. It was cutting edge. It was innovative. It was widely respected throughout the world.

And I want to make this point, as well, just as Ms. Peters did, that the vast majority of Enron's 20,000 employees were incredibly talented, incredibly hard working, incredibly dedicated to Enron. However, the rottenness of Enron was at its top, the tone at the top. Mr. Skilling, along with others, pushed an agenda of paper profits over real profits, of manipulating financial numbers in order to meet Wall Street expectations.

They allowed sound business judgment and sound business ethics to give way to expediency and greed. A number of straw man arguments have been made over the course of this case. The Government has never sought to prove that Mr. Skilling set out to bankrupt Enron or that any of the individuals convicted in connection with the Enron crimes set out to bankrupt the company. We've never sought to prove that

Mr. Skilling sought to line his pockets.

02:01 25

01:59

01:59

02:00

02:00

02:01

Like many other white collar criminals,

Mr. Skilling, we believe, believed that he could turn things
around, that he could fix the problems at Enron, the accounting
problems, the financial problems at Enron and move on from
this. But as often happens, when his lies unraveled, when the
accounting fraud unraveled, when Enron unraveled, all of it
came tumbling down. And thousands of employees were left
without jobs, without pensions, some without life savings,
shareholders wiped out. And Mr. Skilling, through it all,
profited tremendously from his sale of his own shares before
others were aware.

Your Honor, we also think Level 35, the 168 to 210 months, appropriately accounts for Mr. Skilling's, his own history and his character. He's had a remarkable -- he had a remarkable climb through corporate America, both at McKinsey and at Enron, at the very top of Enron. He -- we certainly acknowledge that he engaged in a number of philanthropic acts, certainly in part as a result of the lofty position he achieved and the tremendous wealth that he attained. Nonetheless, he certainly gave back to the community, to friends, family, and others that he didn't know. And that's something to be lauded.

He had a tremendous work ethic; by all accounts, is very talented. He was given advantages that few ever even understand let alone have in this world. And that's where the

02:01 1

02:01 5

02:02 10

02:02 15

02:02 20

02:03 25

contradiction arises, contradictions that mar his history. He used those talents, starting in 1999, to lie and cheat.

Mr. Skilling -- it appears Mr. Skilling and others at Enron thought they were above the rules, above the law. Why they did it, we never had to prove. We don't really know. Was it to stay on top? Was it to climb higher in the stratosphere? Was it a misquided effort to help Enron? We just don't know.

But that doesn't change the fact that he knowingly used lies to hide from the public and his employees what was actually happening at Enron. These types of advantages that Mr. Skilling has enjoyed in his history are the types of advantages that usually are taken into account at a sentencing and are considered to make one more culpable that don't have those advantages, that don't start from such a lofty perch.

However, we certainly recognize that post-incarceration, post-conviction, Mr. Skilling has both suffered tremendous tragedy while he's been in prison for his crimes, through the loss of his son and his parents. And there's simply nothing that can be said about that. It's a tragedy. He's also used his talents in prison. We've seen the letters and we've read them and we think it's commendable and he should be — he should be commended for that.

Rehabilitation is reflected in his efforts to work with other prisoners and to assist other prisoners and help them better

themselves as well as helping to better Mr. Skilling himself.

02:04 25

02:03

02:03

02:03

02:04

02:04

And yet, your Honor, we have to return to a key aspect of rehabilitation, which is expressing remorse for his own activities. The Government is simply not aware of a single instance in the 10 years since he's committed these crimes, in the six years since his conviction, in which he's acknowledged his role, acknowledged remorse for his actions in the crimes that have caused so much harm to thousands. The litigation is now complete here. Mr. Skilling, nonetheless, continues to cast himself as a victim. And we would just like to make clear that, from the Government's perspective, Mr. Skilling is anything but a victim.

He was at the center of the conspiracies that were brought before this Court. And it was his role in that that has led to his separation from his friends, from his family, and from the wider community. We would also point out that the Fifth Circuit itself in 2011 made clear on numerous occasions, in it's review of Mr. Skilling's case, that the evidence of his quilt was overwhelming.

Your Honor, we also were -- we certainly know the Court recognizes deterrence, general deterrence, is an important aspect of sentencing, particularly in corporate crimes and white-collar crimes. These cases are difficult to detect, incredibly difficult to investigate and to prosecute. A sentence within the Level 35 guidelines range, 168 to 210

months, we think, will send a strong message that corporate criminals and corporate crime will be punished harshly, and that's the right message to send.

02:06 25

02:04

02:05

02:05

02:05

02:06

Last, your Honor, I want to turn to the victims in this case and talk a moment about them. Ms. Peters' eloquent words certainly captured what many victims have expressed to us, have expressed to the Court, and many who are not able to be here today. Victims have suffered immeasurably. Sure, jobs have been lost, money, financial security, in some cases life savings have been lost. Shareholders have been affected. Small businesses, large businesses have been devastated. The Houston community after the fall of Enron suffered tremendously.

But those sorts of harms we may be able to measure economically. It's the many non economic harms that we've read about in victim letters, for example, that, I think it's important for the Court to remember. Victims have talked about having lost trust, having become deeply cynical about the marketplace, about our economic system, about business leaders, about corporate America as a result of the Enron crimes, as a result of Mr. Skilling's actions. People have written eloquently of physical ailments and emotional scars that have lasted years, as a result of these crimes.

Now, the reality is that no prison term, no prison sentence in this case is ever going to bring back

anything that these -- these harms that these victims suffered and that the defendant caused for them. But we do believe that a sentence within the 168 and 210 month range will be a significant sentence that is both necessary and appropriate in light of the harms that Mr. Skilling has brought down upon thousands in this community. And we would ask the Court to impose a sentence in that range.

THE COURT: Thank you.

02:08 25

02:06

02:07

02:07

02:07

02:08

Mr. Petrocelli?

MR. PETROCELLI: Thank you, Mr. Stokes.

Your Honor, I think you can appreciate from my long history in this case that there's much about the Government's allocution with which I disagree; but I need not take issue today and I need not quarrel today. Because even accepting everything the Government has said in its allocution and in its sentencing memo, it is the Government's position that that is fully consistent with a sentence within the Level 35 range, which includes 168 months.

The Government is not making an argument in its allocution that 168 months is not an appropriate sentence. To the contrary, the Government specifically agreed that any sentence within Level 35, which includes 168 months, is an appropriate sentence. And the Court correctly pointed out at the outset that, even without the sentencing agreement, based on the Fifth Circuit's initial decision, we would be at Level

02:08 1 36.

02:10 25

02:08

02:09

02:09

02:10

And when the Court initially sentenced

Mr. Skilling back in -- I think it was October 23rd, 2006 -the Court applied the low end of the guideline, which called
for a sentence of 292 months. So were we here without a
sentencing agreement and were the Court to apply the low end of
the guideline, we would be looking at Level 36. Low end is 188
months.

So with this agreement the low end takes us to a modest reduction of 20 months, to 168 months, which I submit is the appropriate sentence in light of all the circumstances.

And we've gone through the Section 3553(a) factors in detail in the sentencing memo and -- having learned long ago, I know your Honor reads everything and remembers everything. So I'm not going to repeat what we said in the sentencing memo. I just want to call out a few things if I may.

For that modest 20-month reduction, as the sentencing agreement indicates, Mr. Skilling would agree to waive valuable ongoing litigation rights. Your Honor knows that we have been valiantly fighting every step of the way, all the way up to the Supreme Court and back, a couple of trips to the Fifth Circuit, and we had plenty of work still to do before your Honor, including a Rule 33 motion for a new trial, including a contested sentencing hearing in which the loss calculation would have to be fought from scratch given the

elimination of the honest-service theory by the Supreme Court.

02:12 25

02:10

02:10

02:11

02:11

02:11

We had further appeals from those issues. We had fights about restitution issues and, then, 2255, perhaps, as well. So there were lots of litigation work and rights that remained. And Mr. Skilling has been willing to surrender those rights in order to obtain the modest 20-month reduction of a 168 months' sentence, your Honor.

In addition, Mr. Skilling has forfeited virtually all property and assets that he has, which amounts to approximately \$41.8 million. And after your Honor decides the sentence, we do have to come back to the amount, because the judgment was estimated back in 2006 at 45 million because various properties had not liquidated. They've now liquidated, and that amount is actually 41.8 million, approximately. And we can give you the exact breakdown of that.

Mr. Skilling is willing to forego any further challenges to the \$41 million, and that money would be made immediately available to the victims. As I understand, it would be administered through the fund that Judge Harmon has set up, your Honor, which has other proceeds having to do with the Enron cases.

I don't need to talk to you about Jeff's conduct before and during the events in question. We went over that in exhaustive detail the first time around in 2006. And I recall, your Honor, that, on the record before you gave out the

02:14 25

02:12

02:12

02:13

02:13

02:13

sentence in 2006, you, yourself, noted the good works that Mr. Skilling had done leading up to the events in question, the exhaustive charitable work, helping friends, and doing it all without any need or desire for public recognition, just to help people, something that he has carried through throughout his life and during his lengthy stay in prison so far.

You talked about his early success at Enron, building up this great company before the events in question, and the love of his family. And, of course, all that remains perhaps even more true today. As far as the conduct of Mr. Skilling during the events of the trial and the events of the collapse of Enron, I have no desire to go over all that again.

I just want to point out, your Honor, that the record was quite clear, perhaps undisputed, that Mr. Skilling never once sought to loot the company, to steal money, to line his pockets with secret deals. He did not -- he turned down tens of millions of dollars of compensation increases. He -- when the company was collapsing, he offered to give back virtually all of his property and money in order to help save the company.

And by the end of the trial, the Government, itself, told the jury that Mr. Skilling was not motivated by greed. And I do think that makes a qualitative difference in determining the appropriate sentence, your Honor, compared to

those convicted defendants who were trying to steal money, hide money, the kinds of things, for instance, that Andrew Fastow did.

02:16 25

02:14

02:14

02:14

02:15

02:15

And on that point, your Honor -- I made these arguments to you before, so I'm not going to repeat them, the issue of unwarranted disparities. Mr. Fastow was supposed to receive a sentence of 10 years; and, because of his cooperation, he got six years. So without regard to any cooperation, he should have served 10 years. A sentence of 168 months is 14 years. It's four years higher than Mr. Fastow, who, by far, by anybody's account, including the one juror who wrote in to your Honor, was the most culpable person on the entire Enron story. And he received six years and, without any cooperation, would have received 10 years.

And I also pointed out that Mr. Causey, who ended up getting five and a half years, based on his cooperation, but under his agreement he didn't have to cooperate. And without any cooperation, he would have received seven years. And he was indicted in virtually the same case as Mr. Skilling and virtually the same allegations. And so I think that 14 years is vastly higher than any other Enron defendant and more than meets all the objectives of Section 3553.

And in particular, your Honor, I want to say few words about post-incarceration factors and the post-incarceration conduct. Mr. Skilling reported to prison on

02:16

02:16

02:16

02:17

02:17

02:17

December 13, 2006. He's been there some 78 months now. He served almost two months of home confinement with the electronic monitoring before he served. And we were going to ask you Honor have your judgment acknowledge the credit he should receive for his home confinement.

THE COURT: As I mentioned to you, Mr. Skilling, that's really an issue for the Bureau of Prisons.

I'm not going to reduce his sentence because of that. He can pursue his prison remedies to seek a credit if he wishes.

MR. PETROCELLI: Okay. And since the time that he has been incarcerated, your Honor, he has, from day one, tried to be a productive, constructive, positive inmate. He noticed for example that there was — there were language barriers between Spanish-speaking inmates and English-speaking inmates. And so he decided to teach Spanish speaking — he decided to teach the English-speaking inmates Spanish. The only problem is Mr. Skilling did not speak Spanish. So what he did is he learned Spanish while he taught the inmates, and he's been teaching Spanish throughout.

He's been helping inmates with their English, helping them write letters. He helped head up a job fair or a work fair program in the prison, where people who were about to be released and would be looking for gainful employment, would need to present résumés, and he helped to explain to them and

02:19 25

02:19

02:18 15

02:17

02:18

02:18

teach them how to do that. And he, as we pointed out in our sentencing memo, does all of this without trying to get any recognition from anybody and, frankly, without anybody really knowing.

The example of the blind man, who's the inmate that serves with Mr. Skilling. And Mr. Skilling offered to read him the newspaper. And so every day, he takes this blind man and they go to a different place, where nobody can see them, and the man is not embarrassed -- and Mr. Skilling is not trying to earn brownie points -- and he reads him the newspaper.

He -- he has attended all kinds of courses. He's attended business courses. And it caused one of the professors at the local college to remark, you know, "I can't teach you anything. You ought to be teaching the students business."

And we all know how much Mr. Skilling loves business. So he, too, has been teaching business. And, you know, we visit him often, and we talk to him often. And I am amazed at the remarkable strength, endurance, courage, and character of this person.

And he has lost his mother, he has lost his father, and he has lost his 20-year-old son and he could not even attend his funeral. And I just cannot imagine the punishment and the pain that he will forever have to experience of being in a lonely cell while his son was being buried.

02:21 25

02:19

02:19

02:20

02:20

02:20

And I think it was unfair for the Government to say he is not ever expressed remorse. I don't quite know what they mean by that. But if you go back to the October 23, 2006, transcript, at Page 13 -- Mr. Stokes of course, was not here, so perhaps he hadn't read that. But Mr. Skilling talked about the remorse that he felt. He said, "I can't imagine more remorse. I have friends who have died, good men." And the collapse of Enron will forever, ever haunt him and damn him; and he has to live with that the rest of his life, and all the people he let down, your Honor.

He loved the company and he saw it fail and it was a failure of enormous proportions. He loved the people who worked there. He didn't want to hurt them. He loved the community that he lived in. He loves Houston. He loves his family. His two children need him more than ever. His wife needs him more than ever. And he wants to come home. He wants to come home here.

And if he's given a sentence of 168 months, which is 14 years, he still has quite a ways to go, your Honor. But we will be there. We will greet him and we will come home with him and he will have at least an opportunity to have the last part of his life so that he can play a meaningful role again, a meaningful role in society, meaningful role in this community, to be a productive, positive force the way he was before and the way he has been since his incarceration.

And you have read the letters about people who 1 2 just are amazed, people, the inmates. We had what? Some 15 3 letters from inmates. We have over a hundred letters from this year alone, for this sentencing hearing alone, from people all 4 5 over, including almost 40 from former Enron employees, people who didn't even know Mr. Skilling, who didn't work for 6 7 Mr. Skilling, who talked about how much he can contribute to 8 society.

And I just ask your Honor that you give him that opportunity, to be a productive person again in this community. And with that, your Honor, I will sit down.

THE COURT: Thank you. Mr. Petrocelli, this may be your last appearance before me. So I want to say you've done an excellent job over these years representing your client. You're a credit to the bar, and I hope Mr. Skilling appreciates the fine work that you and the other attorneys with your firm have done for him these many years.

MR. PETROCELLI: Thank you.

THE COURT: Because the Court certainly acknowledges it.

MR. PETROCELLI: Thank you.

THE COURT: This is not an easy decision. Sentencing is the most difficult part of my job and certainly the least pleasant part of my job.

As both counsel have stated, Mr. Skilling has a

02:22 25

02:21

02:21

02:21

9

10

11

12

13

14

16

17

18

19

21

22

23

24

02:22 15

02:22 20

02:24 25

02:22

02:23

02:23

02:23

02:24

family and many friends who support him. It is true that he has contributed to the early growth and success of Enron and that he has helped many people through charitable contributions and other good works and, more recently, by helping other prison inmates.

The advisory guideline range of 168 to 210 months envisions a long period of imprisonment because the sentencing commission and Congress have determined that crimes of this magnitude deserve significant punishment. The evidence at trial established that Mr. Skilling repeatedly lied to investors, including Enron's own employees, about various aspects of Enron's business, and that Mr. Skilling illegally sold a large amount of his own Enron stock based on inside information before Enron collapsed.

Title 18 of United States Code, Section 3553, sets forth a number of factors in addition to a defendant's advisory guideline range that Congress instructs Courts to consider in determining a sentence. In this case, the two most significant factors are the need for the sentence to deter others from committing similar crimes and the need for the sentence to reflect the seriousness of the offense, to promote respect for the law, and to provide just punishment for the offense.

Having carefully considered all of the information and arguments presented to the Court and based on

02:26 25

02:24

02:25

02:25

02:25

02:26

the Court's familiarity with the facts of this case, the Court concludes that a sentence of 14 years, or 168 months, in prison adequately addresses all of the relevant sentencing factors.

The Court is not persuaded that a longer sentence is necessary either to provide additional deterrence or to satisfy any other sentencing factors.

Mr. Skilling, would you please stand?

THE DEFENDANT: (Complies).

THE COURT: Pursuant to the Sentencing Reform Act of 1984, you are hereby committed to the custody of the Bureau of Prisons for a term of 48 months as to Count 1S, followed by 120 months as to all of the remaining counts, to run concurrently with each other and to run consecutive with Count 1S, for a total sentence of 168 months in prison.

The defendant's motion for judicial recommendation, which is Docket Entry 1331, is granted; and the judgment will reflect the recommendation of the Court that the defendant be designated by the Bureau of Prisons to a federal correction facility in either Pensacola, Florida, or Montgomery, Alabama, and that should the defendant otherwise qualify for participation in the Bureau of Prisons residential drug abuse program that the defendant be placed in such program.

Upon release from imprisonment, the defendant shall be placed on a term of supervised release for three years

as to each count, to run concurrently. All of the terms of 1 supervised release in the original judgment will remain in effect.

In addition, I would like to propose an additional term. The letters indicate that Mr. Skilling has a real talent in helping people find work, even while they're in prison. So the Court would like to recommend, as an additional condition of supervision, that Mr. Skilling be required to perform 300 hours of community service related to helping people find employment, during the first year of supervised release under the supervision of the probation officer. I say "would like to" because I will not impose it if you think it violates the terms of the sentencing agreement.

MR. PETROCELLI: Mr. Skilling?

THE DEFENDANT: I'm perfectly happy with that, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. I take it you think that special condition is consistent with the sentencing agreement. Is that correct?

> THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I do. Thank you.

THE COURT: All right. Then, it will be imposed.

Also --

02:26

02:26

02:27

02:27

02:27

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

02:27 25

MR. PETROCELLI: May I ask for one minor modification? That you add Leavenworth, Kansas, or Yankton, Iowa?

THE COURT: I've already got this typed out.

MR. PETROCELLI: I know. It was -- after that 1 02:27 2 compliment you gave us, I dropped the ball. But there are two 3 other -- we want to give them more choices. 4 THE COURT: Okay. Do you have that written down? 5 MR. PETROCELLI: Yes. 02:28 6 And I also don't know my geography. Mr. Skilling 7 has told me it's Yankton, South Dakota; Leavenworth, Kansas. 8 THE COURT: Isn't it cold up there? 9 THE DEFENDANT: It is, yes. THE COURT: I thought you were finally glad to get out 10 02:28 11 of Minnesota. 12 I'll add Yankton, South Carolina --All right. 13 Yankton, South Dakota, and Leavenworth, Kansas. 14 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir. 02:28 15 MR. PETROCELLI: Thank you. Sorry about that. 16 THE COURT: May I proceed? 17 MR. PETROCELLI: Yes, your Honor. 18 THE COURT: Pursuant to the Stipulated Forfeiture and 19 Restitution Settlement Agreement and the Court's October 23rd, 20 2006, Order of Forfeiture, the Court concludes that the 02:28 21 restitution provided in the agreement and order is 22 proportionate to the defendant's culpability. Restitution is 23 therefore satisfied through the agreement and order, and their 24 terms will be incorporated into the judgment. 02:28 25 The Government has filed a final -- a motion for

a final order of forfeiture; and that motion, which is Docket Entry 1331, is granted. The order doesn't reflect a particular amount. The Court's current information is that the forfeited amount is approximately \$42 million.

MR. PETROCELLI: Yes, 41 million --

02:30 25

02:29

02:29

02:29

02:29

02:30

THE COURT: Wait just a second. Has the Government agreed with the figure you're getting ready to read?

MR. STOKES: We haven't, your Honor. The figure that Mr. Petrocelli is about to read is the figure at the time we filed the motion. The funds are held in interest-bearing accounts and so that figure will have changed and so we won't know the final amount until the actual transfer of money takes place. So, hence, we've requested forfeiture of the amounts in the accounts without designating a specific amount.

THE COURT: What I would like to do is have the judgment reflect approximately \$42 million. I think the Rules of Criminal Procedure allow forfeiture provisions to be added several months after the judgment. So you can provide the actual amount of forfeiture once you've agreed upon it, and we'll incorporate that by amendment in the judgment.

MR. PETROCELLI: Thank you. That's fine.

THE COURT: All right. It is further ordered that the defendant pay a special assessment to the United States of \$100 per count of conviction, for a total special assessment of \$1,900.

		ll .
02:30	1	Mr. Skilling, pursuant to the sentencing
	2	agreement, you have no right to appeal your conviction or
	3	sentence. Do you understand that?
	4	THE DEFENDANT: I understand that, your Honor.
02:30	5	THE COURT: Does either counsel wish to say anything
	6	else?
	7	MR. PETROCELLI: Yes. The \$1,900 was paid.
	8	THE COURT: I know, but the judgment the judgment
	9	still needs to recite it.
02:30	10	MR. PETROCELLI: Okay.
	11	THE COURT: It has been paid. They won't come after
	12	him twice.
	13	MR. PETROCELLI: Okay.
	14	THE COURT: I'll ask the probation officer, she's
02:30	15	standing.
	16	THE PROBATION OFFICER: Yes, your Honor. I believe
	17	it's the "second superseding indictment."
	18	THE COURT: It is.
	19	THE PROBATION OFFICER: I believe you read
02:31	20	"superseding indictment."
	21	THE COURT: I was getting tired. Instead of saying
	22	"second superseding" over and over again, I just figured you
	23	would know.
	24	THE PROBATION OFFICER: I will reflect that in the
02:31	25	judgment.

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: Thank you.

MR. STOKES: Nothing further from the Government.

THE COURT: Anything else?

MR. PETROCELLI: Nothing further.

THE COURT: Counsel are excused. The defendant is

remanded to the custody of the marshal. Court is adjourned.

(End of requested proceedings)

* * * * *

COURT REPORTER'S CERTIFICATION

I certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript from the record of proceedings in the above-entitled cause.

Date: June 25, 2013

/s/ Cheryll K. Barron Cheryll K. Barron, CSR, CMR, FCRR Official Court Reporter